

Bibliothèque,
Le Séminaire de Québec,
3, rue de l'Université,
Québec 4, QUE.



CANADA AND MR. GOLDWIN SMITH.



THOSE residents in the United Kingdom who desire to maintain unimpaired the connection so happily subsisting between it and the Dominion of Canada, will naturally expect from some representative of the opinions of the vast majority of the Canadian people, a reply to Mr. Goldwin Smith's contribution to the September number of the CONTEMPORARY REVIEW. Notwithstanding the title of the paper, its apparent object is to prepare, those who believe in the competency of its author to make forecasts, for the separation at no distant period of the Dominion of Canada from the British Empire. He has elsewhere maintained that "ignorance of the future can hardly be good for any man or nation," and being endowed with a prescience, to which other fallible mortals lay no claim, he conceives it his duty to give timely warning of the Political Destiny of Canada. He repudiates altogether the notion that he is a revolutionist, or an annexationist. He holds that "to tax forecast with revolutionary designs or tendencies is absurd," but, on the other hand, it is "to renounce statemanship" "for those who are actually engaged in moulding the institutions of a young country, not to have formed a conception of her destiny." Holding as he does—though as it will be shown most erroneously—that Canada, owing to her position as a dependency, has incurred expenditure "for military and political railways," he thinks that this "is enough to convict Canadian rulers of flagrant improvidence," unless the permanency of the present system is clearly established in their minds. What Mr. Goldwin Smith has frequently maintained is, that Canadian policy should be based on the assumption, that the absorption of Canada in the United States is her inevitable destiny, and as it would be manifestly impossible to carry out such a policy without avowing it, most people will probably come to the conclusion that it is not altogether absurd

"to tax forecast with revolutionary designs." It is perhaps needless to remark, that those "engaged in moulding the institutions" of Canada, whether "Liberal-Conservatives" or "Reformers," whether "Protectionists" or "Free Traders," have faith in the permanence of the system, by which expression is merely understood a belief that it is as likely to be permanent as any other established Government. Mr. Goldwin Smith, claiming the gift of prescience, has made a forecast, that at no distant period there will be a disruption of the Dominion of Canada, owing to the secession of one or more of the Provinces of which it is composed, and he professes to believe that this will take place without civil war. In a paper which I contributed to the *Fortnightly Review* in May last, I noticed that, when invited to point out an instance of such amicable separation, Mr. Goldwin Smith had cited such cases as Alaska, Cyprus, Alsace-Lorraine, and the Transvaal as "changes of allegiance without civil war." Unfortunately the illustration did not hold good in the case of the Transvaal. But I pointed out that in all of these cases territories were transferred by one great power to another, just as, in the event of an unsuccessful war, Great Britain might be compelled to transfer Canada to the United States. Mr. Goldwin Smith has laboured assiduously, as well in Canadian as in British and United States periodicals, to induce the belief that some design has been formed to introduce "Imperialism,"—or, to use his favourite, though wholly unmeaning expression, "Jingoism,"—into Canada. He has even condescended to quote extracts from a dancing master's appeal for patronage, and to dignify the author with his own title of professor. His unremitting efforts to sap the loyalty of the Canadian people having proved unavailing, he has sought by his late contribution to persuade the people of England that no reliance is to be placed on the continuance of the subsisting connection between the United Kingdom and the Dominion of Canada.

The Canadian tariff is an unfortunate subject for one who professes to believe in the influence of "Jingoism." It will not be imagined for a moment, by any intelligent person in the United Kingdom, that Imperial influence was used to inaugurate the present Canadian tariff. On the contrary, that measure has been a crucial test of the good faith of the mother country in conceding independent government to the Dominion. Whatever may be deemed the merits or demerits of the Canadian tariff, or of the respective policies of Free Trade and Protection, the tariff was framed in accordance with the wishes of the Canadian people, after a direct appeal to them, and it is not unworthy of remark that Mr. Goldwin Smith, although theoretically a free trader, "took the stump"—to use an American electioneering phrase, which he has himself applied by innuendo to Lord Dufferin—in support of the protectionist party. It is probably more congenial to his taste to appeal to the British public in the columns of a review than "to take the stump" in Canada in defence of the tariff which he lent his influence to

establish. The arena on which a free trade policy for Canada must be discussed is on her own soil; and it is a significant fact, and well worthy of the attention of the British public, that at the very time when Mr. Goldwin Smith, a professed free trader, was occupied in defending the Canadian tariff, the Hon. Mr. Blake, the leader of the Canadian Opposition, was engaged in one of the most remarkable political campaigns of which there is any record. Mr. Blake is a practising barrister, a resident of the City of Toronto, and being by universal admission second to none in his profession, the value of his time may be readily imagined. For upwards of two months Mr. Blake was engaged in addressing public meetings in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island, in favour of free trade, and in condemnation of the present tariff, with what success, those who do not pretend to be able to make forecasts must be satisfied to learn after the next general election. Meantime, while Mr. Blake and his friends declare themselves quite satisfied with the result of his tour, the Ministerial and Protectionist Party are equally sanguine that he did not succeed in making converts to free trade.

In order that there may be no mistake as to the grounds on which Mr. Goldwin Smith defends the present Canadian tariff, it seems desirable to cite a few brief passages from his contribution to the *CONTEMPORARY REVIEW*:—"Nor is the Canadian tariff protectionist, except in relation to the Coal Tax, which is imposed avowedly for the purpose of compelling Western Canada to burn Nova Scotia coal, but does not concern England." Special notice of the coal tax, as concerning England, will be taken before the close of these remarks; meantime, further extracts on the main point at issue will be given:—"It is the offspring of clear fiscal necessity." . . . "The character of the tariff as a revenue tariff is thus vindicated by the result." . . . "The writer of this paper has been assured by leading commercial men in Canada, who are in principle free traders, and who are unconnected with politics, that the measure was as well framed as the circumstances would permit." . . . "The object announced from the throne was not the protection of native industry, but the equalization of revenue with expenditure, and the framers are men who have always professed Free Trade sentiments, besides being the heads of the Conservative or Imperialist party." . . . "The tariff, though not in the proper sense protectionist, has a quasi-protectionist aspect." . . . "It may be at once granted that to Canada a protectionist system would be ruinous." . . . "The motives of the Canadians in framing their new tariff were purely financial and commercial." In refutation of the foregoing statements of Mr. Goldwin Smith, reference may be made to some prominent articles subjected to duty, and to the opinions of those who are responsible for the tariff, as to the objects they had in view. The articles selected as fair illustrations of the protective character of the Canadian tariff, are cottons and woollens, the aggregate duties on which are about

twenty-five per cent. of the entire Customs revenue. And it will not be difficult to determine whether the duties on those classes of goods establish the correctness of Mr. Goldwin Smith's assertion, that "the object was not the protection of native industry, but the equalization of revenue with expenditure." In the case both of woollens and cottons, the general rate of duty on all articles not specified, is twenty per cent., which is only two and a half per cent. more than the duty on unenumerated articles under the old tariff. The specified articles in woollens, such as shawls, blankets and flannels of every description, cloths, doeskins, cassimeres, tweeds, coatings, over-coatings, cloakings, felt cloth of every description, horse-collar cloth, yarn, knitting yarn, fingering yarn, worsted yarn under number 30, knitted goods—viz., shirts, drawers, and hosiery of every description, are liable, in addition to 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, to a specific duty of seven and a half cents per pound weight. On clothing, ready made, and wearing apparel of every description, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the Alpaca goat, or other like animals, made up or manufactured wholly or in part by the tailor, seamstress, or manufacturer, except knit goods, ten cents per pound, and twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*. It is alleged by Mr. Goldwin Smith that "the tariff is directed, if against anybody, against the people of the United States, who were excluding Canada from their markets, and at the same time throwing their surplus goods, whenever there was a glut, at very low prices into the markets of Canada." Let this assertion be tested in the case of woollen goods. In the year 1878, before the new tariff went into operation, the imports from Great Britain were over 8,000,000 dollars in value, while those from the United States were about 400,000, or five per cent. of those from Great Britain.

Turning now to cottons, the proportions from the two countries in 1878 were from Great Britain \$4,400,000 and from the United States \$2,488,000. In the case of cottons, the percentage of imports from the United States is larger than in that of woollens, but still the English imports were considerably in excess. It would be tedious to state in detail all the specific duties on cottons, but reference will be made to a few leading articles. "On grey or unbleached or bleached cottons, sheetings, drills, ducks, cotton or Canton flannels, not stained, painted, or printed, one cent. per square yard, and 15 per cent. *ad valorem*." On all cotton jeans, denims, drilling, bed-tickings, gingham, plaids, cotton or Canton flannels, ducks and drills, dyed or coloured cottonade, pantaloons stuffs, and goods of like description, two cents per square yard, and 15 per cent. *ad valorem*. On cotton wadding, batting, &c., two cents per lb., and 15 per cent. *ad valorem*. On cotton shirts and drawers, cotton hosiery, clothing made of cotton, 30 per cent. Cotton sewing thread in spools, 20 per cent., in hanks, 12½ per cent., a protection of 7½ per cent. being allowed to the importer of hanks. It surely cannot be necessary to enter into a more detailed examination of Mr. Goldwin Smith's free-trade tariff, which he has been assured by

leading commercial men in Canada, who are in principle free traders, and who are unconnected with politics, "Was as well framed as the circumstances would admit." The writer of this Paper does not believe that there is a leading commercial man in the Dominion of Canada who is "unconnected with politics" if the meaning of that expression be taking no interest in the political contests. Of course there are many men, who might properly be so designated, who have not come forward as candidates for the representation of the people in Parliament.

It is inconceivable that any sincere free trader can approve of the present tariff, and it must be sufficiently obvious that if Revenue alone had been the object it might have been obtained as easily by adhering to the principle of the old tariff, which was to obtain the bulk of the Customs Revenue by an *ad valorem* duty on unenumerated articles. It has been shown that the tariff is strictly protective in its character, and it may be desirable to prove that it was deliberately intended that it should be so. If the framers are, as Mr. Goldwin Smith alleges, "men who have always professed free trade sentiments" they must either have materially changed their views, or else, like Mr. Goldwin Smith, who professes still to be a free trader, and who, moreover, declares that "a protectionist system would be ruinous to Canada," they must have a strange mode of giving effect to their convictions. In a recent address delivered at Montreal by Sir John A. Macdonald, Prime Minister of Canada, at a reception given him after his return from a protracted absence in England, the following passage occurs:—

"When Mr. Mackenzie's Government succeeded us, they carried out their principle of free trade to the fullest extent. Mr. Mackenzie, at least, had the courage of his convictions. In the House and out of the House he announced himself as an absolute free trader. We took issue with him on that question, and it will be remembered that every session I moved resolutions declaring our principle. We submitted our case to the country; and if there was ever a case, in which a general election was decided upon a simple issue, it was that of 1878. It was a question of free trade and protection, and the country declared itself in a manner which could not be misunderstood."

Sir John Macdonald is so thorough a protectionist, that, during his recent visit to England, he expressed himself so strongly in favour of a protective policy for Great Britain, as to have his opinion quoted by the Duke of Rutland, on the occasion of a Conservative celebration at Sheffield. It seems unnecessary to dwell further on the Canadian tariff question, and more especially, as it is not the object of the writer of this Paper to discuss the subject on its merits, but to combat the opinions of the learned essayist on the relations between Great Britain and Canada. Before leaving the subject, however, the promised notice of the coal tax must be taken. That such a tax "does not concern England" is an extraordinary statement in view of facts. In the year 1880, the last for which there are statistics, the imports of bituminous coal into the Province of Quebec, and the Maritime Provinces, were, from Great Britain 144,841 tons, and from the United

States 3,382 tons. Ontario obtained its coal almost entirely from the neighbouring States of Ohio and Pennsylvania, and not a ton from Great Britain; Nova Scotia has its own collieries; and New Brunswick is supplied chiefly from Nova Scotia, but it takes a much larger quantity from Great Britain than from the United States. The coal tax does not compel Ontario consumers to burn Nova Scotia coals, it only compels them to pay a tax on United States coals. Its practical effect is to cause the consumer in the Provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick to use Nova Scotia coal, or to pay the tax on British. This the figures above quoted prove most satisfactorily. Another statement in the Paper under consideration, relating to the tariff, is calculated to mislead. It is as follows: "There is a rider to the tariff, providing that if the United States will lower their duties, Canada will lower hers." It would naturally be inferred that the rider, as it is termed, was applicable to all classes of goods, whereas it is limited to natural products, such as animals, grain of all kinds, butter, cheese, lard, tallow, coal, salt, &c., which were formerly admitted duty free into both countries, under the reciprocity treaty. Those who are familiar with the views of Mr. Goldwin Smith, as propounded by him on various occasions during the last few years, will not be surprised to find that, while vindicating the protective tariff of Canada as a necessary measure, he has endeavoured to throw upon the Imperial Government the entire responsibility for its adoption. He says that "Imperialism, though it may be a magnificent policy, is a policy for which you pay; and that for the increased duties laid by her North American Colonists on her goods, England has mainly herself to thank." Although most unwilling to introduce on this occasion anything of a personal nature, the writer can scarcely avoid noticing a direct reference to an alleged warning given by him that Canada's "liabilities are being piled up at a most dangerous rate, and that the reckoning day is at hand." This charge was preferred in the year 1880, in the May and June numbers of the Canadian *Bystander*, a monthly periodical, in which, during a period of eighteen months, Mr. Goldwin Smith commented on current events throughout the world. It was founded on a passage in an article contributed by the writer of this paper to the *Montreal Journal of Commerce*, which it was alleged was inconsistent with an approval of the decision of the House of Commons of the Dominion, to prosecute the construction of the railway in British Columbia. The charge was met at the time, and an extract or two from the reply will be a sufficient answer to the repetition of it in the CONTEMPORARY REVIEW:—

"We are not inclined to discuss the Pacific Railway with the *Bystander*, because it is impossible that an advocate for the annexation of Canada to the United States can enter into our views on the subject. If by the term 'Imperialist' the *Bystander* means one who is in favour of maintaining the existing institutions of the Dominion, then we feel assured that it is correctly applied to Sir Francis Hincks, but we cannot admit that such a term is properly applied to persons holding the views of an overwhelming majority of the people of Canada."

As to the charge of expressing an opinion that Canada was "drifting into bankruptcy," the reply was:—"Our reason for using the expression drifting into national bankruptcy was that the policy of the Government, and of Parliament, was to discourage imports to the utmost of their power, and that some zealous supporters of the Government were advocating a resort to *fiat* money to be used for the construction of public works." It was never suggested in the article that the construction of the Pacific Railway should be postponed, but the undertaking of new enterprises, especially railroads, was deprecated. The imputation that "England has mainly herself to thank" for the Canadian tariff, is merely a repetition of what Mr. Goldwin Smith has been alleging for a considerable time back. The charge in his own words is as follows:—"Of the public debt of Canada, half, at least, may be set down to the account of public works, undertaken not so much for the commercial objects of the Colony, as for the political objects of the Empire, and especially to the account of a vast system of political and military railways, destined to carry into effect a policy of British antagonism to the United States."

The foregoing statement can only be met with an unequivocal denial. I affirm boldly and unreservedly that the Imperial authorities are not responsible, directly or indirectly, for one dollar of the expenditure on Canadian public works. The work especially referred to is the Intercolonial Railroad, of which it is said:—"The construction of this work is enjoined upon the Dominion by the Imperial Act of Confederation, and was promoted by an Imperial guarantee. It has cost about 30,000,000 dollars." It is to me inconceivable how Mr. Goldwin Smith could have ventured to repeat such a statement. The Imperial Act of Confederation was framed in accordance with the wishes of the Canadian people, who were represented in London, at the period of its enactment, by a body of delegates, including some of the present Dominion Ministers, the Premier, Sir John A. Macdonald, having been chairman. The terms had been previously agreed upon by a larger body of delegates, which met at Quebec for their consideration. The project was first started in Nova Scotia, nearly forty years ago, and Canada joined with the Maritime Provinces in soliciting the co-operation of the Imperial Government, so far as to place an officer of the Royal Engineers in charge of the survey, the Provinces undertaking to defray all expenses. Can it be said that by complying with such a request, the Imperial Government incurred responsibility? In course of time, Major Robinson, the engineer officer selected, completed his survey, and recommended in substance the line finally adopted. After the reception of the Report, the Colonies interested entered into negotiations among themselves as to the amount of their respective contributions; and a delegate from Nova Scotia proceeded to England, and succeeded in prevailing on the Imperial Government to recommend a guarantee for debentures to be issued, so as

to enable the Colonies to raise the necessary loan on more favourable terms than they could have done on their own security. The Imperial Government was strongly urged to take a share in the work, but persistently declined doing so. In process of time a difficulty arose as to the location of the line in New Brunswick. Nova Scotia had always been favourable to the North, or Major Robinson's line. In New Brunswick, the principal settlements were in the valley of the river St. John, and the majority of the representatives of the province were strongly in favour of a southern line, which would have passed through the cities of Fredericton, the Capital and St. John, the principal seaport. The representatives of the northern counties had comparatively little influence. The New Brunswick Government positively refused all aid to the northern line. In the year 1852, the writer of this paper, then first Minister of Canada, accompanied by two of his colleagues, visited Fredericton and Halifax, with the view of effecting an arrangement, if possible, in which all the provinces could concur; and the result was a compromise, by which New Brunswick agreed to assume a larger share of the liability, for the benefit of Nova Scotia; the latter consenting to adopt the southern line of the valley of the St. John. In the spring of that year I proceeded to England, in company with the late Lieutenant-Governor Chandler, of New Brunswick, and arrived shortly after the change of Ministry. The correspondence on the subject had been carried on with Earl Grey, who was then Secretary of State for the Colonies, and it was hoped that his lordship would sanction the change of route. It is needless to discuss the subject, further than to state that Lord Derby's Government felt it their duty to adhere to Major Robinson's line, and that the negotiations fell entirely through, and were not resumed for a considerable time. Meantime, Canada constructed a portion of the line, south of the St. Lawrence, and east of Quebec, through the instrumentality of the Grand Trunk Company; Nova Scotia constructed a portion, if not the whole of her section of the line; and New Brunswick constructed lines, which were deemed of most commercial importance. No aid or interference of the Imperial Government was sought while these roads were being constructed. In process of time the Confederation of the Provinces became a subject for consideration; and after lengthened discussions and negotiations between the leading statesmen of the various Provinces interested, a measure was agreed on, which Her Majesty's Imperial Government was solicited to sanction. The Secretary of State was the Earl of Carnarvon; and it is scarcely necessary to bear testimony to the zeal which was displayed by His Lordship in mastering a subject of great intricacy. It will surely not be contended that Great Britain incurred any responsibility for the Intercolonial Railroad because she consented to embody in the act one of the conditions stipulated for by the delegates from the three Provinces. The British America Act of 1867 had the cordial assent of those delegates, and of

the Provincial Legislatures; although, on grounds wholly unconnected with the Intercolonial railroad, there was dissatisfaction with the Act in Nova Scotia, until Sir John Macdonald's Government, after a full consideration of the objections entertained by the representatives of that Province, introduced a measure which is sneeringly referred to by Mr. Goldwin Smith, as "better terms," but which the representatives of the whole Dominion did not hesitate to pass into law. After Confederation, the question of the line became again the subject of discussion. The great majority of the Ministers, including all from the Province of Quebec, favoured the Northern, or Major Robinson's line, modified in some respects by the Chief Engineer; while of the two Ministers from New Brunswick, one was for the Southern, and the other for the Northern line. The two Members who differed from their colleagues, very properly yielded their opinions, although pressure was brought to bear on them to induce them to resign. Such is a faithful history of the Intercolonial Railway; but it may not be out of place to cite the opinion of the *Toronto Mail*—a leading organ of the Protectionist Government—which, as might be expected, has "no fault to find" with regard to Mr. Smith's views "on the main question of the tariff." On the other point, the *Mail* declares:—"It is an exaggeration of the worst kind to contend that our public works were undertaken for Imperial—meaning Military purposes. They were, in fact, undertaken for purposes purely commercial and colonial, and their political importance, even in the case of the Intercolonial Railway, was quite a secondary matter in the minds of the men responsible for their inauguration." A few remarks on the Pacific Railway seem to be necessary. The construction of this gigantic work originated with the Government of British Columbia which sent three delegates to Ottawa, to negotiate for the admission of that province into the Dominion. The existing communication between Canada and British Columbia, is by the United States Railroad, known as the Central Pacific, to San Francisco, and thence by steamer to Victoria. It was proposed by the British Columbia delegates that Canada should at once construct a turnpike road to the Pacific, and spend not less than a million of dollars a year on a railroad. The Canadian Government, after a long negotiation, agreed to build the railroad, and to complete it in ten years; and Parliament ratified the agreement. Great complaint has been made of the shortness of the time, and experience has proved that it was wholly inadequate. It may fairly be considered in the light of what is known as an "imperfect obligation," binding the Dominion Government to exert itself to the utmost of its power to complete the work. Owing to alterations of plans—consequent partly on political changes—the work has been delayed, but it is at present making rapid progress, and there is just ground for hope that no further complications will ensue. Mr. Goldwin Smith states that "the very company to which the construction of the Pacific Railway has been consigned is in part American, and has

its head-quarters at St. Paul, Minnesota." The head-quarters of the Canada Pacific Railway Company are at the City of Montreal, where its president, vice-president, and secretary reside. The foundation for the above statement is, that a few years ago, some Canadian capitalists, in conjunction probably with friends in New York, purchased a line of railway having its head-quarters at St. Paul. Some, possibly all, of these gentlemen, in conjunction with other capitalists in England, France, and the United States, entered into negotiations with the Dominion Government for the construction of the Pacific Railway, which were ultimately successful, and which were in due course sanctioned by Parliament. Mr. Goldwin Smith disapproves of the construction of the line through British territory, taking the same view as the Canadian opposition. It is not intended to discuss the merits of the line adopted, but merely to call attention to the injustice of describing as "a political line" a railway authorized by the Canadian Parliament, and without the slightest interference on the part of the Imperial authorities. It is said, "like the Intercolonial, it has received an Imperial guarantee." This is a misleading statement. No guarantee was given in aid of the Pacific Railway. At the time when Canada was called on to give its consent to those provisions in the Treaty of Washington, which affected her interests, there was just ground of dissatisfaction that the question of compensation for losses sustained in repelling the invaders of Canadian territory from the United States had not been entertained by the Joint High Commission. It is needless to enter at any length into the merits of the claim; but it was thought not unreasonable by the Canadian Government, that if the United States claimed compensation on the ground of the failure of Great Britain to prevent the sailing of the *Alabama*, Canada might justly claim adequate compensation for the omission of the United States Government to prevent the Fenian invasion of her territory. What bears on the present question is, that the Canadian Government proposed as a mode of settling a question of considerable difficulty, that Great Britain should guarantee a portion of the cost of constructing the Pacific Railway, and should likewise consent to the diversion to the same object, of a guarantee, previously sanctioned, for the erection of fortifications. Under the circumstances stated, I must positively deny that Great Britain gave any direct aid to the Pacific Railway. It would have been given to any other Canadian object. As Mr. Goldwin Smith admits that the terms arranged between the Government of Canada and the Pacific Railway Company were the best that could be obtained by able negotiators; as he further admits that the organizers of the company are men of the highest character; and as he is of opinion that if the work, and the contracts connected with it, were in the hands of Government, there would be great danger, if not certainty, of corruption, little more need be said of the Pacific Railway. It is, however, worthy of remark that, while in England certain papers have not hesitated to denounce the scheme, and

to endeavour to destroy the credit both of the Canadian Government and of the Company, its Canadian opponents describe it as "a gigantic swindle," and profess to believe that the profits will be enormous. It will scarcely be denied by any one but Mr. Goldwin Smith, that whatever may be the merits or demerits of the Pacific Railway scheme, Canada alone must bear the responsibility, and enjoy the benefit, or suffer the loss, that may result from the undertaking. The two great works already noticed are those more particularly referred to by Mr. Goldwin Smith; but the cost of the great ship canals, the enlargement of which was provided for by the Confederation Act, as well as the Intercolonial Railway, forms a considerable portion of the Canadian debt, and most assuredly the Imperial authorities have never interfered with those works, which, though costly, have far more than repaid the country for all that has been expended on them. There is a curious passage in the paper under consideration, which may be cited here:—"To the expenditure on Canadian public works in general, a percentage may be said to have been added, by deduction from the line of commercial advantage, in the interest of imperial policy. Of this the Rideau Canal is an example. It may well be doubted whether the author of the foregoing passage understood the subject on which he wrote. The Rideau Canal was constructed some sixty years ago by Great Britain, at her own expense, avowedly as a military work. It was projected soon after the last war in the United States, and many years after completion was handed over to Canada, merely to save the cost of maintenance. What bearing it has on the charge that Imperialism has put Canada to great expense it is difficult to comprehend. Again, it is charged that the Act of Confederation has given Canada "a needless, complicated, and expensive form of government." The answer is simple. Not only was the Federal system established at the request of the Canadian people, but the seven provinces, after fourteen years trial, prefer to be separate. Surely their wishes ought to prevail rather than those of Mr. Goldwin Smith. There are many who believe that it would be a wise policy for Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward's Island to unite and form one government, and who are likewise of opinion that much expense would be saved if all the Provinces would follow the example of Ontario, and abolish the Legislative Councils. What end is to be gained by discussing such questions for the benefit of the people of England? Surely Mr. Goldwin Smith would not wish the Imperial Parliament to compel the Provinces either to unite or to abolish their Second Chambers. In connection with this subject, it will not be irrelevant to cite the opinion of the Speaker of the Ontario Legislature. That gentleman, during a recent visit to the United States, was interviewed, according to modern custom, and his answers to the interrogatories put to him occupy a large space in a Chicago newspaper. Among the numerous subjects to which his attention was called, are some which have been treated by Mr. Goldwin

Smith, and amongst them is the one just noticed—viz., the number of small governments. It may be remarked that the Speaker of the Ontario Legislature is a reformer. He says:—

"There are few, if any, who seriously desire a return to the old state of things. Some have talked in favour of a Legislative Union rather than a federal one, but they would be among the first to resist such a change were it seriously proposed. It would be as impracticable with us as with you. Having once tasted the advantage of provincial control of provincial affairs, not even Conservative Quebec would abandon the free exercise of such powers."

The same gentleman, who is not an Imperialist, but a staunch radical reformer, assures his questioner, who cannot comprehend Canadians desiring to remain "in leading-strings," that they "have no sympathy with the few attempts at the introduction of annexation sentiments made by Constitutional grumblers."

The next complaint is, that a militia organization is kept up, and "a good deal of money has been and is wasted on military preparations against a foe who will never come, and whom, if he did come, with his immense superiority of numbers and resources, it would be impossible to resist." It is not very long since this very militia was suddenly called on to defend the country from invasion at a time of profound peace with the nation which furnished the raiders. It is, however, needless to discuss the subject or the question, whether "the police too is inadequate." The police are chiefly maintained by incorporated cities and towns, and really Mr. Goldwin Smith should be satisfied to leave such questions to be discussed in the Dominion Legislature on the estimates of the Minister of Militia and Defence, and should abstain from dragging before the English public the details of the Canadian estimates.

It is rather amusing to read the passages in Mr. Goldwin Smith's paper referring to "an attempt to kindle Jingo sentiment in Canada," and to "Canadian Jingoism beginning to spit fire at the American Republic," and to the consequences of which the prescient writer has made a forecast. It is one of the delusions of the writer that there is a hostile feeling towards the citizens of the United States on the part of those Canadians who refuse to believe in his power to make forecasts of the future. The manner in which Canadians of all shades of party received the news of the calamity which recently befell the American nation affords conclusive proof that the most friendly sentiments are entertained throughout the Dominion towards the citizens of the United States. Surely Canadians may be allowed to prefer their own institutions and to frame their own tariff, without subjecting themselves to the charge of entertaining unfriendly feelings to their neighbours. As to the merits of the respective systems of Government, the Speaker of the Ontario Legislature stated to his interviewer:

"You are beginning to discover the defects which exist in your own system, and I cannot help thinking that, before many years pass, you will take a leaf

from the history of the mother-land, and improve your institutions still further by the adoption of the responsible system of government which has existed for two centuries in England, and has given the people direct Parliamentary control over the Executive—a control, let me add, much more effective than that which you now possess.” “What you mean no doubt is that the members of the President’s cabinet should hold seats in Congress, and be directly responsible to the people.” That is my meaning.” “I thank you for the remark. The same thought is frequently expressed by some of our own political students.”

Those who doubt Mr. Goldwin Smith’s object should read attentively the passage in his paper commencing :—“What is the object, so far as the English people generally are concerned, of all these desperate efforts ; of wasting all this money ; of running all these risks ? Suppose the dreaded consummation were to arrive to-morrow. Suppose to-morrow the English-speaking race in North America were to become a single confederacy.” The waste of money and the risks are all to be consequent on the realization of a dream or delusion of Mr. Goldwin Smith, that “Canadian Jingoism would spit fire at the American Republic,” that ill-feeling between England and the United States would be revived, that England contemplates egging on a British dependency to place itself in an attitude of antagonism to the United States, and compelling the United States, which are now content with the smallest of peace establishments, to put their army and navy on a more costly footing.” Mr. Goldwin Smith has not pointed out a single act performed or a sentiment uttered in Canada, at which the United States can with justice take offence. The relations between the two countries are of the most friendly character. It is true that Mr. Goldwin Smith, who, having made a forecast, has spared no efforts to bring about the result which he has predicted, endeavours to irritate the Americans by stating that “the tariff is directed, if against any body, against the people of the United States,” and by calling their attention to the “diminished importation of American, and increased importation of British, goods.” The Americans are far too shrewd to be misled by such statements. They know well that the principal cause of the decreased exportation of their goods to Canada is the increased demand in their home markets, from a revival of trade, and that their previous large exportations, when Canada was made what has been termed their “sacrifice market,” were caused by the serious depression of trade, and consequent overstock of goods. There are times, as the English manufacturers are well aware, when forced sales must be made, and it is the universal custom to make them in foreign rather than in home markets. The Americans cannot complain that their exports are admitted into Canada on the same terms as those from Great Britain, although they might prefer Mr. Goldwin Smith’s scheme of a commercial union, under which Canada would adopt the high protective tariff of the United States, and admit all American goods free of duty, a singular mode, it must be admitted, of establishing free trade.

Mr. Goldwin Smith has been unsparing in his efforts to convince the people of Canada that this scheme of "Commercial Union" would be beneficial and feasible; but, although frequently challenged to explain how it could be practically carried out, and although it is notoriously repudiated by all thinking men in the United States, except those who make no secret that their real object is to obtain possession of Canada, he has maintained a discreet silence. The annexationist view was plainly stated in the paper contributed by the writer to the May number of the *Fortnightly*, and was in substance that they wanted political union to follow commercial union. But Mr. Goldwin Smith denies "that anybody, either in Canada or in the United States, is attempting, or at all wishing, to precipitate the course of political events," the meaning of which is, that, out of regard to their own necks, no one will prematurely get up a rebellion, such as was "precipitated" in 1837, and brought several unfortunate men to the gallows. Mr. Goldwin Smith does not propose to attack the citadel by storm, but to make very gradual approaches, the first of which is "Commercial Union;" and it must be admitted that in recommending such a measure, in an English periodical, and specially to English readers, he has displayed not a little courage, or, as some might characterize it, audacity. He does not hesitate to declare that—

"The customs line across the Continent must be removed, nor can there be any doubt as to the growth in Canada of opinion favourable to commercial union," adding "all men of sense are contented to leave the political question to the future, feeling, that it would be unwise, as well as wrong, to do violence to any existing sentiment, and that the indispensable condition of a change in the external relations of the country is the full and deliberate consent of the great mass of the people."

In view of the fact that there is not a single Member in either House of the Canadian Parliament who has ventured to recommend this scheme of Commercial Union, there is no cause for alarm. Mr. Goldwin Smith, however, labours under the delusion that the Canadian Parliament does not represent the opinions of the Canadian people. When reminded in Canada of the fact that his opinions were not represented in Parliament, he replied that the politicians would not allow any one holding them to get a nomination. Now he declares that "power is practically in the hands, not of the people, but of the politicians, who, as a class, and without distinction of party, are naturally wedded to a system, which, as has been truly said, causes Canada to grow more politics to the acre than any other country in the world." He, however, consoles himself with the belief that "what frightened Imperialists call 'a shadowy party' is beginning to appear," although he afterwards admits that this "shadowy party" is one that "appeared in force at the last general election, when the people left the old party lines by thousands," and voted for the Protectionist, against the free trade candidates, as Mr. Goldwin Smith

advised all those, whom he was able to influence, to do. The Commercial Union scheme, it must be admitted, has been framed with some ingenuity. All that is asked is freedom of commercial intercourse on the American Continent, which would have a charm for free traders, as well as protectionists; the former would have free trade over the North American Continent, while the latter would have extravagant protection against the rest of the world. Then the great forecaster of events calculates, and not without reason, that if Canada were to enter into a Commercial Union with the United States, based on a high tariff against Great Britain, there would be a general demand for the severance of the political connection, and annexation would be peaceably accomplished, before the stupid advocates of Commercial Union had had time to comprehend the consequences of their folly.

Mr. Goldwin Smith has undertaken, in a portion of his paper, to give advice to the Imperial Government as to the qualifications which they should seek in a Governor-General of Canada. The principal of these qualifications is, that the Queen's representatives shall not be sent "to use their influence as Governors-General in propagating anti-continental sentiment." Now, it must be sufficiently obvious that continental sentiment is wholly inconsistent with loyalty to the Queen and British connection, by which it is not intended to convey the idea that the American people have not the strongest feelings of veneration and regard for Her Majesty. It is, however, manifestly absurd to suppose that the sentiments of the citizens of a republic can be favourable to monarchical institutions. The utterances of Governors-General are almost invariably delivered in response to loyal addresses from the people, or their representatives. It would certainly be rather an anomalous position in which to place a Governor-General, to instruct him to be careful not to propagate anti-continental sentiment, when her Majesty's Canadian subjects addressed him, as they invariably have done, with assurances of their devoted loyalty to their Sovereign, and attachment to the political institutions which they enjoy under the protection of the Empire. Mr. Goldwin Smith, however, holds that "there is little use in appealing to a Colonial Secretary. Make a Liberal Colonial Secretary and he at once becomes a *Jingo* of the drab, if not the scarlet species." It has long been apparent that the Earl of Dufferin was no favourite of Mr. Goldwin Smith, and it caused no surprise when he made eulogistic remarks on his lordship's predecessor, Lord Lisgar; remarks in which there will be general concurrence on the part of all those who had the opportunity of forming a correct opinion. I learn for the first time that "Lord Lisgar's administration is treated with scorn by the admirers of the more ambitious *régime* which followed." I had the honour of serving under both the noblemen named, though for a longer period under Lord Lisgar. The compliment paid to Lord Lisgar, that "he did not go on the stump, meddle with the press, or use his high station

to propagate his own opinions," can only be interpreted as an insinuation that Lord Dufferin committed all those reprehensible acts. Both noblemen faithfully performed their duty to the Crown and to the Canadian people; but there is no doubt that Lord Lisgar did not visit the various provinces and cities of the dominion to anything like the extent that his successors have done; and the inference to be drawn from Mr. Goldwin Smith's language is, that by not doing so he has incurred "scorn." It would therefore appear to be his opinion that "going on the stump," or, in other words, receiving and answering loyal addresses from the people, is very wrong, but at the same time very popular. The implied charge of "meddling with the press" is one that cannot be substantiated, and which I refrain from characterizing. Lord Dufferin was wholly incapable of meddling improperly with the Press.

Mr. Goldwin Smith has not failed to lend his assistance to those who have endeavoured to injure Canadian credit. He warns English capitalists "to be cautious how they send politicians in quest of a reputation, to earn one by a brilliant administration of Canada." He states that "a large amount of English money—too large an amount, as some authorities assert—is invested, not only in the public debt of the Dominion and in Canadian railways, but in Canadian mortgages and debentures." He then states that the farms of Ontario are reduced in value twenty or thirty per cent., and "are carrying a heavy load of mortgage debt." It would be well if farms in other parts of the Empire were as little reduced in value as those in Ontario; but it is probable that the investors in the securities named do not require advice on the subject. The public debt of the Dominion ought not to have been classed with railroads and mortgages; but it is scarcely necessary to make any remark on the warning, further than that no well-informed person has the least apprehension that Canada will fail to meet in the future, as it has done in the past, all its pecuniary obligations. Mr. Goldwin Smith professes to be apprehensive that, at the next election, the advocates of a national currency, or, what is termed in the United States, *flat* money, will "sweep the country," as the Protectionists did at the last election. He must, however, be well aware that the advocates of a similar currency have ten times the influence in the United States that they have in Canada, and that, nevertheless, they cause no alarm.

I will only remark, in conclusion, that it is with deep regret that I have witnessed the persevering efforts of Mr. Goldwin Smith to persuade those over whom he has influence, that the Imperial Government is responsible for the expenditure on Canadian public works, and that the subsisting connection is disadvantageous to both countries.

F. HINCKS.

To the EDITOR of THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW.

SIR,—In *The Contemporary Review* for October, there is an article upon my knowledge of the land and the people in which and with whom I dwell. The article is written with the avowed object of telling and teaching the public that instead of knowledge I am possessed by an absolute ignorance of both the country and the nation. The name appended to the article is unknown to me, but the methods of warfare used are very hackneyed ones, and it would not be worth while to say a word about them, were it not that when an obscure writer takes it upon herself to attack and correct a well-known author, the former should be at the least careful of and very sure of her weapons of offence.

I pass over the offensive personalities of the paper, and also the stale device (so often favoured by reviewers who have nothing else to say) of attributing neglected typographical errors to the ignorance of the creator of a book. But when, beyond this, your contributor proceeds to put forth her own mistakes as superior culture, it seems to me time to undeceive her as to her own qualifications for the office she has assumed.

Your contributor considers that she has proved my want of accurate knowledge of the people with whom I have lived for ten years, when she discovers the provincialism *Ferragosto* spelt with two r's, and put in the mouth of a modern speaker. Now *Ferragosto* occurs in the "Village Commune," only in an ancient ballad quoted there—the sweet and tender *rispetto*, which begins *Al piè d'un faggio*, and which my humble heroine sings on the eve of her bridal. No less an authority than Professor Tigri spells the word with two r's. When the maiden of the ballad says her lover will give her the nuptial ring at *Ferragosto*, she uses the expression as meaning the first day of August, not the August fair.

Stenterello is not the Tuscan Punch, as your contributor states; he is one of the mimes who, with Punch, Harlequin, and others, made the laughter of Italy for so many centuries, until Goldoni crippled their omnipotence. *Stenterello* is still the jest-maker of the Florentines, but he is not the Punch: miserliness is his chief feature, and the satirists of Florentines quote him therefore as their type. I certainly do know how his name is spelt, as it stares me in the face, in letters a foot long, on all the theatrical announcements of every Carnival.

Your contributor quotes *strombetti* as an impossible word, and triumphantly conjectures that I printed it by some confusion of mind with *stornello*, with which, she proceeds to add, it has no resemblance. Now, *strambetti* is a very old troubadour's word, which is still in use amongst the peasantry of the Tuscan mountains to designate any sort of amorous poetry, even as it did in the Middle Ages. Therefore, not only is the word entirely correct, but it has an affinity with the *stornello*, or any other kind of Italian love-lay. Professor Tigri, by whose authority I am again content to abide, derives it from *strani motti*.

These three examples will serve to show how your contributor's zeal in detraction has outrun her wisdom. As regards the municipal forms of administration, she denies the accuracy of my description of them, without giving a tittle of evidence that she has been in any position to study them. She speaks of a syndic as of a functionary solely elected by the will of his community; whereas a syndic's appointment must be submitted to the prefect (nominally to the king), and, as a matter of fact, the prefects interfere with and influence these nominations all over the country, so that the men of whichever ministerial party is uppermost should be chosen. In the winter of this year I became acquainted with the most disgraceful facts of prefectorial interference whereby a Tuscan noble, who had been syndic of his district for twenty years, and universally beloved, was turned out by intrigue, that he might be replaced by a new man who held the politics of the ministry, whilst the Marchese had belonged to the Conservative side.

This is but one instance of a system of ministerial pressure which prevails throughout the land.

I cannot understand how any woman can applaud conscription. Had she sons to be torn from her she assuredly would not do so. At its best, it can only be a stern and sad necessity, and I believe the results here to be unmitigated evil. I believe that every object of training might be obtained by a volunteer system like that of England; but though the young men desire this, the Government is afraid of it, and refuses permission for it. The loss of their sons to the army falls most cruelly on the agricultural classes. A contadino, whilst his son is away, has to pay a labourer to replace the lad. I doubt very much myself whether a *bultero* on the Campagna, a sheep-herd on the Maremma grasslands, a Pistoiese woodman amongst his chestnut woods, is any the happier or better for learning to read indifferently and write a scrawl. Reading and writing, even if the unmixed boon and legal birthright of man that a certain school declares them to be, may be too dearly bought, and are not worth the sacrifice of homely virtues and cleanly living, and sage contentment with a humble lot. In Italy, as in France, the newly-acquired power of reading is chiefly used for the perusal of inflammatory and communistic newspapers. Here, as in France, the peasantry are sensible, peace-loving, and averse to agitation; it is the towns which are the centres of eagerness for unconsidered war and foolish credulity of bombastic Radicalism. Myself I prefer the unlettered mountaineer of the Luchese hills who can recite the "Gerusalemme Liberata," learnt by ear, and has as fine a sense as Mendelssohn of true melody in music, to the "educated cad" of the Turin or Florence streets, who has just heard enough of

Fourier and Bradlaugh to think that society ought to maintain at ease his ugly idleness, but who could not for the life of him tell you the name of a field flower, or say by heart a line of Tasso. The town-youth of Italy is for the most part lazy, conceited, ready to sponge on any relative rather than work; and I believe this to be in a great measure owing to the military service, which takes the young men from their trades and occupations, and from their home life, at the most critical time of their existence, and takes them into the coarse and noisy life of barracks; always a debasing one in time of peace.

As for De Amicis' military sketches, they are pretty and tender tales written from an optimist's point of view; but they are laughed at by Italian officers as "rose-water"—*anglicised*, humbug. Moreover, the opinion of no Piedmontese is to be taken seriously as of any political worth; the Piedmontese have got all the plums out of the cake, and naturally declare and believe that no cake was ever better mixed, or better baked, or more excellent for digestion.

If I did not know the language of the country I live in, I should not have as much brains as the dullest green parrot, for I could read and write Italian when I was a child, and I have now lived, as I have said before, ten years in Italy, with many of its country people in my employ. All the abuses I have described in the "Village Commune" I have drawn from facts; and I may add that one of the most famous of the *Liberali* thanked me for the book, and added, with a sigh, how difficult it was to introduce any reform against the temper of apathy and interested egotism which marks alike the highest and the lowest officials of the land. When an honest minister does come into office, depression and weariness settle down on him at sight of the Augean stable of corruption he has to cleanse, and the net-work of "wire-pulling" wound around all public life. Endless and unscrupulous office-seeking replaces all statesmanship and stifles all parliamentary life.

It may be said that this is a matter of opinion not capable of mathematical demonstration. But I have never heard anyone qualified to judge deny that this is the true description of the body politic of Montecitorio. It is a great pity that in England the old kind of "No Popery" feeling tinges the views of so many, inasmuch that they believe because Rome has been taken from the Popes, all the cardinal virtues and eternal felicity must needs have entered in the breach made by Porta Pia. Your contributor attributes to me "violent partisanship." Of what? Certainly not of the *Progressisti*. As certainly not of the *Papalini*. Of what then? Of the entire people?

I am happy to accept the indictment. Nevertheless, though I do charge the nobility with supineness and too great indifference, the statement that I hate the upper classes will surprise my Italian friends, and is distinctly false. It is not the aristocracy who furnishes either the *impiegati*—or the ministries—on whom my work of the "Village Commune" declares war.

I will add, in conclusion, that the assumption that the *borgo* of Santa Rosalea is the *borgo* of Siqua, is incorrect. Siqua was once and for all described in my novel which bears its name, and Santa Rosalea is sketched from a much less picturesque and less historically interesting place.

I beg to remain, sir, yours obediently,

Oct. 14, 1881.

OUIDA.

ERRATA IN "CIVILIZATION AND EQUALITY" IN THE OCT. NO.

- Page 653, line 1 should read "when he learns I am able to accept it, I am," &c.
 " 658 " 9 from bottom, for "defence" read "difference."
 " 59 " 11, for "only" read "really."
 " " 24, delete "very."
 " 661 " 10, for "original source" read "material."
 " " 27, for "would" read "could."
 " 662 " 17 from bottom, for "burdens" read "bewilders."
 " 663 " 10 " for "commonly" read "conceivably."
 " " 9 " for "It is quite true" read "It is true indeed."
 " 666 " 4 " should read "Even that is doubtful," replied Seacorts; "but, at all events, it was desire for," &c.
 " 667 " 22 " for "It is as," read "It is a."
 " " 20 " for "product" read "production."
 " " 12 " for "make" read "create."
 " " 7 " for "genius" read "genesis."
 " 668 " 7 " for "impossible" read "possible."
 " 669 " 12, for "The shaft that you thought meant for," read "The shaft that was aimed at."
 " " 28, for "doing" read "attempting."
 " 672 " 26, for "cheering" read "cherishing."